DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 979 SP 022 808

AUTHOR Stier, William F., Jr.
TITLE The Status of Physical Education within Junior/Community Colleges.
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (Minneapolis, MN, April 7-11, 1983). For related document, see ED 058 875.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Athletic Coaches; *Athletics; *College Curriculum; *College Faculty; Educational Trends; *Physical Education; Physical Education Facilities; Physical Education Teachers; Program Budgeting; *Program Evaluation; Teaching Experience; Tenure; *Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study of the status of physical education and athletics programs in two-year colleges was part of a followup to an earlier national study conducted in 1971. Questionnaires were sent to a national sample of 300 institutions; 174 (58 percent) were returned. Data on the size of physical education departments, type of school governance, size of college communities, and the training and experience of the faculty were collected. All institutions surveyed were coeducational, and 90 percent were public. A majority of the colleges had liberal arts and vocational-technical curricula, and the physical education departments offered activity or service classes to the student body as a whole. In addition to information on the scope of programs offered, the study sought to examine current policies, practices, and procedures used in the administration, organization, and conduct of the programs, and the use of available facilities. Results indicate that, over the past 10 years, there has been a decrease in the number of years required of students in the service program. Methods of program evaluation were investigated as well as the status of athletic coaches and their opportunities to gain tenure. Responses indicate that the majority of athletic administrators felt no significant impact from Title IX. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William F. Stier, Jr.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP022 808

THE STATUS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION WITHIN JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A national investigation of physical education programs within junior colleges and community colleges was conducted in 1983 as part of a follow up to an earlier national study conducted in 1971 and reported in the professional literature in May of 1972. The survey instrument utilized in the earlier 1971 investigation was reviewed, revised and adapted for use in the current national study.[1]

The 1983 national investigation sought to examine not only the scope of the physical education and athletic programs within such institutions but to also ascertain current policies, practices and procedures utilized in the administration, organization and conduct of such programs and the utilization of available facilities.

The revised survey instrument was mailed to 300 randomly selected junior colleges and community colleges in the continental United States. The institutions responding with completed and usable questionaires numbered 174 for a 58% rate of return.

All of the institutions were co-educational and 90% were public institutions. Only 10% were private institutions with 8% being private with no religious affiliation. A majority of the institutions were on the traditional semester system (66%) while the quarter academic calendar was utilized in 22% of the responding institutions.

Of the institutions studied, 41% had an undergraduate enrollment between 2000 and 7500 students with 51% of the schools being situated in a community with a population between 10,000 and 100,000. Sixty percent of the schools had an undergraduate enrollment between 500 and 7500.

Almost half of the responding institutions considered themselves to be strictly liberal arts institutions; 38% indicated that they were

both liberal arts and vocation-technical type institutions. Finally, 8% were classified strictly as vocation-technical institutions.

There were 84 majors in the physical education programs in the schools. Of the students desiring to pursue a career under the HPERD/A umbrella, 70% desired to be involved in athletic coaching, 80% desired to go into teaching health and/or physical education, 34% sought involvement in recreation type programs, 21% desired fitness programs and 20% indicated an interest in athletic training/sports medicine. The students indicated more than one choice of a career path and hence were willing, even eager, to pursue possible future employment in teaching and/or coaching; coaching and/or athletic training; teaching and/or recreation, etc. Only 11% of the schools had more than 100 full time physical education majors within the pre-professional preparation program. And, only 14% of the institutions studied had more than 5% of the total school population involved in the physical education pre-professional preparation program or the terminal professional preparation program.

Seventy-eight percent of the schools had a pre-professional preparation program (necessitating that students transfer to a four year institution to obtain the four year degree) while 22% provided the terminal (either one or two year degree/certificate program) degree.

The number of full time faculty members within the entire institution averaged 85 males and 58 females. The average number of staff members (full and part-time) having some teaching responsibilities in the HPER & D arena was 4.99 males and 2.64 females (for a grand average of 7.63 full and part-time departmental teaching staff). There were more male faculty members than female faculty members in the entire institution in 79% of the schools studied and this percentage was almost identical (78%) when the researcher examined the ratio of

male faculty members to female faculty members.

The teaching ratio of teaching staff to the number of students pursuing a program within the HPERD arena was 9.2 to 1.

The years of experience coupled with degrees held of full time departmental staff members are summarized below.

Experience	Bachelor's		Master's		Specialist's		Doctoral		Totals
	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Sch.	Tea.	Tea.
Under 2 yrs.	11	14	16	20	0	0	0	0	34
2-5 yrs.	13	22	28	32	0	0	1	1	55
Over 5 yrs.	37	104	143	634	13	18	42	53	809
	61	140	195	686	13	18	43	54	898

The largest number of full time staff members hold the masters degree and possess more than five years teaching experience credited to them. Full time faculty members with master's degrees account for 76.39% of the full time physical education teachers while those professors holding the coveted doctoral degree account for only 6% of the full time teaching staff within HPERD.

However, part-time faculty with the master's degree make up 53.63% of the total number of part-time physical education teachers while teachers with the bachelor's degrees who are part-time account for 43.06% of the part-time staff.

The highest degree held by the departmental chairperson was the master's degree in 74% of the schools. The doctoral degree accounted for only 18% of the chairpersons while the specialist degree (sixth year terminal degree) account for a meager 4% of the degrees held by the chief administrator of the department.

A significant number of chairpersons (72%) had been at their present institutions for ten years or less. Only 2% had been at their institutions for 21 years or longer while 18% had been in the same institution for 11-15 years and some 8% had been there for 16-20 years.

However, in terms of the total number of years of teaching/ administrative experience, the chairpersons tipped the scales at the other extreme with 51% having had 21 or more years of teaching/ administrative experience at their present or other institutions. Only 3% had fewer than three years of total expereince. Over 88% of all the present chairpersons had 11 or more years of teaching and/or administrative experience at their present or other institutions. The average length of time of the total teaching and/or administrative experience enjoyed by these chairpersons totaled just under twenty years.

Teaching experience is required prior to appointment to the departmental teaching staff in 64% of the institutions while 36% indicated that their department would hire non-experienced staff members for teaching posts. A similar but slightly lower percentage of respondents (59%) also revealed that coaching experience was a prerequisite for appointment to coaching/athletic tasks. Fifty six percent of the schools require both coaching and teaching experience prior to hiring an individual for coaching and teaching duties, while only 8% required coaching experience prior to hiring someone for coaching but did not require teaching prior to hiring someone for teaching duties. Similarly, 8% of the schools required prior teaching experience before hiring an individual for teaching duties but did not require prior coaching experience prior to hiring an individual for a coaching post.

Coaches are required to teach as a matter of policy in 70% of the responding institutions and individuals having dual coaching/teaching responsibilities are hired as coaches first in 21% of the schools, hired as teachers first in 48% of the schools and hired as both

teachers and coaches (equal emphasis) in only 31% of the programs. Staff members who function as both coaches and teachers have the right to earn tenure as teachers in 80% of the physical education departments. Surprisingly, 13% of the institutions allow coaches to earn tenure as coaches.

Evaluation techniques utilized within the HPERD departments for teaching competency centered principally around four distinct methods.

Evaluation Techniques Utilized Within HPERD Departments For Faculty

Types of Evaluation Techniques

# of Depts.	%	Self-E.	%	Stu.-E	%	Admin.-E.	%	Peer-E.	%
2	1.21	Yes	2.35	Yes	1.38			Yes	3.93
28	16.96	Yes	32.94	Yes	19.44	Yes	20.59	Yes	54.90
8	4.85	Yes	9.42	Yes	5.55				
38	23.04			Yes	26.38	Yes	27.94		
41	24.85	Yes	48.23	Yes	28.48	Yes	30.15		
9	5.45			Yes	6.26	Yes	6.62	Yes	17.65
9	5.45					Yes	6.62		
12	7.72			Yes	8.34				
5	3.03	Yes	5.88			Yes	3.67		11.76
6	3.64					Yes	4.41	Yes	11.76
6	3.64			Yes	4.17			Yes	
1	.61	Yes	1.18						
		85	100%	144	100%	136	100%	51	100%
		(51.51%)		(87.27%)		(82.42%)		(30.91%)	

The four methods of faculty evaluation and the percentage of institutions which utilize the techniques are provided above: Self-Evaluation (51.51%), Student-Evaluation (87.27%), Administrative-Evaluation (82%) and Peer-Evaluation (31%).

It is interesting to note that 25% of the administrators revealed that Self-Evaluation, Student-Evaluation and Administrative-Evaluation accounted for the greatest single "system" of faculty evaluation closely followed by Student-Evaluation and Administrative-Evaluation (23%). Ranked in the number three position was the procedure whereby all four

methods (17%) were utilized to determine competency in the classroom.

In terms of evaluation techniques which were utilized within the institutions for coaches, the following chart depicts the various methods used by the junior and community colleges.

Evaluation Techniques Utilized Within Schools For Coaches

Types of Evaluation Techniques

# of Depts.	%	Self-E.	%	Stu.-E.	%	Admin.-E.	%	Peer-E.	%	Won/Loss	%
15	9.38	NO EVALUATION FOR COACHES AT ALL									
5	3.13					Yes	4.07	Yes	23.81		
10	6.25			Yes	32.26	Yes	8.13				
77	48.13					Yes	62.60				
2	1.25							Yes	9.52		
15	9.38	Yes	36.58			Yes	12.19				
3	1.87			Yes	9.68			Yes	14.29		
10	6.25	Yes	24.39								
7	4.38	Yes	17.08	Yes	22.58	Yes	5.69	Yes	33.34		
3	1.87			Yes	9.68						
6	3.75	Yes	14.63	Yes	19.35	Yes	4.88				
2	1.25	Yes	4.88			Yes	1.63	Yes	9.52		
3	1.87									Yes	100
1	.62	Yes	2.44	Yes	3.22			Yes	4.76		
1	.63			Yes	3.22	Yes	.81	Yes	4.76		
160	100%	41	100%	31	100%	123	100%	21	100.00	3	100%
		(25.62%)		(19.37%)		(76.87%)		(13.12%)		(1.87%)	

Almost half (48%) of the responding institutions revealed that the "system" for evaluation of coaches involved only the administrators' evaluation. The second most prevalent "system" ended in a tie between (9.38%) no evaluation at all for coaches and a combination of Self-Evaluation and Administrative-Evaluation. Only slightly less than 2% of the schools indicated that the won/loss record of an individual coach is utilized in termining competency (officially, at least).

The duties of full time physical education staff members usually involve more than teaching as a significant part of their workload. In fact, only 23% of the institutions had staff members who had only

teaching responsibilities. Only 25% of the faculty members have had teaching as their only major responsibility. A majority of the staff members (69%) in 68% of the institutions were involved in teaching and coaching or were involved in teaching and administration or in teaching, coaching and administration. Only 1% of the staff members (full time) were involved exclusively in coaching tasks.

It was noteworthy to see that the priority of two out of every five administrators rested primarily on the coaching competency when hiring new staff while only 1% of all such full time staff members in the schools surveyed were exclusively involved in coaching tasks during 1982-83. This fact coupled with the knowledge that 70% of the schools surveyed had as an institutional or departmental policy the requirement that full time staff members in athletics should be required to teach as well as coach, pointed to the inconsistency with which individuals were being selected and subsequently assigned duties within the physical education and athletic department(s).

The tenure question continued to be a very important and timely subject on many college campuses -- both four year and two year institutions. The vast majority (80%) of the responding two year colleges indicated that coaches who also teach may earn tenure as teachers. This would be in keeping with the institutions' policies and practices of requiring (athletic) staff members to do more than merely coach, i.e., to be involved in the teaching process within the academic community of the institution, whether in one of the HPER & A disciplines or other academic pursuits.

In respect to competency expectations for coaches in the win/loss column, a preponderance of schools (95%) failed to have any official policy or criteria in respect to such expectations for "winning and

losing" in athletic sports. The fact that only 5% of the colleges had adequately addressed this all important area of concern and had developed such a policy or statement suggests a presumption that the criteria for success in the athletic arena would not significantly or exclusively hinge upon the winning or losing record of an individual coach. However, past evidence, even within the spectrum of the junior colleges and community colleges, would tend to caution against complete acceptance of such a presumption.

Part-time physical education staff members are often involved in coaching duties exclusively. In fact, 38% of the institutions (accounting for 30% of the part-time staff) have individuals involved exclusively in coaching duties. Only a small percentage (17%) of part-time staff members (involving 23% of the schools) are involved in teaching and coaching or in the areas of teaching and administration or in teaching, coaching and administration.

Many administrators cited the management or organization of the athletic and physical education department(s) to be of significant importance to the success of the overall athletic and physical education programs. An examination into the department of physical education (or similar designation such as HPERD) in respect to the athletic arena revealed that athletics and physical education are treated as a combined entity in 56% of the institutions while in 44% of the schools the athletic arena is kept separate from the academic world of physical education.

The actual organizational and administrative structures of the physical education and athletic department(s) of the 151 institutions which responded to the question on organizational structure are outlined below. The key elements or issues revolve around three factors. First, whether the position of athletic director and the position of

chairperson are combined or kept separate. Second, whether the athletic director and the chairperson report to different individual(s) or to the same individual(s). And thirdly, whether the athletic director and chairperson report as equals or as unequals to whomever they report.

Reporting Structure of Administrators

Institutions	%	Administrative Structure
9	5.96	Athletic Director reports to Chairperson
7	4.64	Chairperson reports to Athletic Director
42	27.81	AD & Chair report to same Superior(s) as equals
55	36.42	AD & Chair report to different Superior(s) as equals
9	5.96	AD & Chair report to same superior not as equals
28	18.54	AD & Chair report to different superiors not as equals
1	.67	Other
151	100.00	

In examining this chart it becomes evident that in 36% of the institutions the athletic director and chairperson report to different individuals. They report to the same individual(s) in 28% of the schools. Both administrators report on an equal basis in 64% of the programs and on an unequal basis in 24% of the institutions studied.

A vast majority of the physical education programs and athletic programs had secretarial assistance (90%). Some 70% of the administrators had exclusive use of the available secretarial help while 30% had to share the secretarial staff with another department or program.

Of those institutions which had access to secretarial assistance, 35% merely utilized student help, 24% had professional assistance, while 41% made use of both student and professional secretarial personnel. Of the administrators responding to this inquiry, 59% indicated that

the secretarial assistance/service provided by the junior/community college was indeed adequate.

The same percentage of departments of physical education had developed policies and procedures handbooks (45%) as did the athletic departments within the institutions surveyed (however, some institutions had one and not the other while some institutions had both types of handbooks). The fact that over 50% of the schools surveyed failed to have a current athletic handbook of written policies, procedures and practices could be indicative of a lack of advanced planning and sophistication at this level. A similar statement could be made concerning the physical education departments.

Title IX has been credited (and/or cursed) with having significant impact/effect upon the physical education and athletic programs of this country's educational institutions. However, only 28% of the respondents in this national investigation felt that Title IX had such an effect upon their particular program(s) at their institutions.

With the majority of the athletic administrators feeling no significant impact from Title IX, two questions warrant being posed. First, were these programs already in compliance with the act prior to its enactment? Second, are these athletic programs currently in compliance with Title IX and its most recent interpretations?

A question similar to that asked concerning Title IX was posed to the administrators regarding the impact of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Discounting the small minority of administrators who were not even aware of Section 504 (5%), 76% felt that this law has had no significant effect upon the physical education or the athletic programs within their institutions. Only a very small segment (20%) acknowledged that Section 504 had created a significant impact

upon their programs. The administrators, when asked to reveal whether or not their institution and/or programs were currently in compliance with Title IX, indicated that the athletic programs were in compliance in 92% of the institutions and not in current compliance in 8% of the schools. One of the comments provided by a department administrator centered around the theme that a department is in compliance until the government declares it is not in compliance. Such an attitude would seem hard to justify in today's responsible athletic management/administration.

A significant percentage (28%) of the physical education departments had no institutional requirement for service classes. Of those schools requiring physical education service classes, a one year requirement was revealed in 43% of the programs while 29% had a two year requirement. Only 13% of the total population did not even provide service classes.

The activity class requirement was cited as having been changed within the past ten years within 48% of all responding schools. In fact, 29% had had the requirement changed within the previous five years. Of those programs which had a change in the time requirement of the service classes within the previous ten years, a large number (69%) of the chairpersons indicated that the change had been one of decreasing the number of years which were required of students in the service program. Nineteen percent of the schools indicated that there has been an increase in the requirement while 12% indicated some other type of changes took place.

The top twenty physical activities included within the service programs are provided below in rank order.

Rank	Service/Activity Classes
1	Tennis
2	Volleyball
3	Golf
4	Basketball
5	Badminton
6	Softball
7	Beginning Swimming
8	Bowling
9	Soccer
10	Racquetball
11	Gymnastics
12	Modern Dance
13	Advance Swimming
14	Fitness
15	Slimnastics
16	Fold Dance
17	Square Dance
18	Lifesaving
19	Tumbling
20	Football

However, if the activities associated with aquatics were combined into one category; if gymnastics and tumbling were considered as one general category; and, if all dance activities were classified into one group, the top sixteen physical activities in terms of the service program would include:

Rank	Service/Activity Classes
1	Aquatics
2	Dance
3	Tennis
4	Gymnastics/Tumbling
5	Golf

Rank	Service/Activity Classes
6	Basketball
7	Badminton
8	Softball
9	Bowling
10	Soccer
11	Racquetball
12	Fitness
13	Slimnastics
14	Football
15	Track & Field
16	Karate

A majority of service programs had classes graded (85%) while such grades were counted on the students' cumulative GPA. The second (7%) most prevalent method of grading such classes was on the S/U basis. Being graded but not being counted on the cumulative GPA was the situation existing in only 5% of the programs while less than 1% of the programs did not grade service classes in any manner whatsoever.

The most common frequency of class meetings was twice per week (93%). Three days per week for service classes was available in 32% of the schools. Classes were scheduled for the traditional fifty minutes in 42% of the programs. However, there was a significant trend (available in 42% of the schools) to offer classes for longer time blocks than the traditional fifty minutes.

Adaptive service classes were provided for the general student body in 45% of the schools. Substitutions were acceptable for service classes in 62% of the programs. Substitutions such as athletic participation (32%), veteran status (34%) and age (18%) were the three most commonly accepted substitutions. The average age which would allow a student to be excused from service classes was

23.06 years with the range being from 20 years of age to 30 years.

Cuts were allowed in 70% of the service programs. Students were required to dop a service class following excessive absences in 71% of the programs. Students who had missed service classes were allowed to make up absences in 80% of the programs. Various methods of make-up techniques were utilized including special make-up classes (39%) and attendance at other service classes (71%). Students were allowed to test out of service classes by demonstrating competency in 19% of the service class programs investigated.

Absences affect grades (in those service programs in which grades were awarded) in 77% of the programs. Criteria for grades ranged widely with the following criteria being utilized most frequently: knowledge tests (96%), attendance (93%), skill tests (91%), fitness (31%), proper attire (18%), attitude (2%).

The top twenty intramural activities -- in terms of frequency and availability to the student bodies in the various institutions -- are listed below. The list reveals that basketball, volleyball, tennis and softball were the four most popular activities in 1982-83.

Rank	% of Institutions	Specific Activity
1	70.7	Basketball
2	53.4	Volleyball
3	50.0	Tennis
4	46.5	Softball
5	38.5	Ping Pong
6	37.3	Football
7	28.7	Badminton
8	25.3	Billiards
9	24.1	Bowling
10	23.6	Golf
11	22.4	Racquetball

Rank	% of Institutions	Specific Activity
12	18.4 tie	Soccer (tie)
12	18.4 tie	Cross Country (tie)
14	17.2	Archery
15	12.1	Track & Field
16	9.2	Swimming
17	7.7	Water Polo
18	5.2	Baseball
19	4.6	Handball
20	2.3	Wrestling

Out of the 174 responding institutions, 159 (91%) indicated that an active intramural program was in evidence on their campus.

Chairpersons of physical education departments were asked about the role of major students in physical education within the intramural programs in terms of actual participation and officiating in IM contests. It was revealed that 92% of the schools surveyed did not require either major or minor students in physical education to participate in intramural activities while 85% do not require such students to act as officials for IM contests.

A close examination of general participation (men and women) in IM activities revealed that there is significantly greater numbers of male students exhibiting a higher rate of IM participation than their female counterparts. In response to a question concerning the average percentage of participation in IM activities on the college campus for men and women students, 16% of the administrators cited the average male participation on their campuses to be at or about the 50% rate. However, only 6% of these same administrators cited the average female participation in the IM program to be at or above the 50% rate.

The individuals given prime responsibility for organization, administration and supervision of the IM program are designated HPER/IM staff members in 81% of the schools studied. However, only 3% of the institutions had a student appointed to this position of high responsibility. Over 72% of the colleges had a bonafied faculty member or college administrator actually present for all IM activities and competition.

The time factor set aside for the various IM activities and the selection of officials for competition were two vital cogs in any IM program. The most popular time for intramurals were in the evenings on weekdays (97%), weekday afternoons (61%) and weekday mornings (21%). Only 3.38% utilized weekends for activities.

Officials were selected through a variety of means. Volunteers from the general student body were used by 45% of the schools while IM participants were themselves required to officiate in the programs in 18% of the institutions. Physical education administrators required students pursuing a major or minor in physical education to officiate (as a part of an official departmental policy) in 15% of the institutions studied. Almost half (45%) of the schools paid officials for their service -- whether these officials were students, staff or faculty.

The practice of giving awards for IM achievements was in evidence in 96% of the programs. Procurement of awards was through the department of HPER or IM in 68% of the programs. Interesting enough, 8% of the programs required participants themselves to pay for the funding of the awards system. Finally, slightly over 24% of the IM administrators utilized a variety of other means (besides participant and department monies) to finance the IM awards program.

A survey of the facilities available to the athletic and physical education and intramural programs revealed twenty-four most frequently accessible participation facilities. A ranking of these facilities is provided below along with the number of schools possessing the specific areas.

Facilities Available for Intramural Activities/Recreation Activities/ Athletic Activities/Service Class Activities

Facility	Rank	# of institutions	%	# on Campus	%	# off Campus
Weight Room tie	1	156	96.25	154	1.25	2
Tennis Courts tie	1	156	83.75	134	13.75	22
Field House tie	3	154	93.75	150	2.50	4
Gymnasium tie	3	154	90.62	145	5.63	9
Softball Fields	5	140	73.73	118	13.75	22
Other Facilities tie	6	119	58.75	113	3.75	6
Baseball Field tie	6	119	58.75	94	15.63	25
Training Room	8	118	73.75	118	0.00	0
Soccer Field	9	115	65.65	105	6.25	10
Handball Court	10	105	36.88	59	28.75	46
Golf Course	11	92	8.13	13	49.38	79
Dance Room	12	82	50.63	81	.63	1
Bowling Alley	13	81	3.75	6	46.88	75
Games Room	14	64	40.00	64	0.00	0
Football Field	15	63	40.63	49	8.75	14
Wrestling Room	16	61	38.13	61	0.00	0
Gymnastics Room	17	56	33.75	54	1.25	2
Outdoor Track	18	52	28.13	45	4.38	7
Natatorium	19	48	25.63	41	4.38	7
Indoor Track	20	40	20.00	32	5.00	8
Sauna	21	35	11.88	19	3.75	6
Steam Room	22	16	13.13	21	3.75	6
Ice Hockey	23	14	.63	1	8.13	13
Squash Court	24	11	4.38	7	2.50	4

The average seating capacity of the available field houses was 1547 with the range of seating capcities being a low of 200 and a high of 4000.

In response to the question whether the available facilities during the 1982-83 academic year were adequate to meet the needs of the students and the IM programs, fifty nine percent of the responding administrators indicated that -- in their estimation -- the available facilities were indeed adequate, both in terms of programatic needs and student needs.

While 91.4% of the schools taking part in this investigaiton have a planned IM program, less than half (42%) provide for any type of extramural program. A similar percentage (44%) do provide for club sport participation with more club sports being organized through student services (49%) or through student government (26%) than through any other single vehicle. Only 17% of the club sport programs were administered or funded through the athletic department/program. Additionally, 4% of the institutions were adminsitered and 20% were funded through the IM department/program. A variety of other means for administering (9%) and funding (14%) club sports were identified within the sample population.

Further investigation and research is warranted and recommended by this researcher in the following specific areas:

1. Tenure -- the criteria for granting tenure to coaches who also teach on the junior and community college level.
2. Guidelines -- the establishment of concrete guidelines and policies regarding criteria for competency expectation in the win/loss column for coaches.
3. Priorities -- the hiring priorities of staff members on the junior and community college scene in both coaching and teaching tasks.
4. Hiring Criteria -- examination into responsibilities assigned in light of criteria utilized in the selection and hiring of coaches who also teach.
5. Title IX and Section 504 — the impact of these two laws on the HPERD & A arena and the current status of the HPERD program in light of the acts' rules, regulations and interpretations.
6. Evaluation -- programs, policies and procedures, teachers, administrators and coaches.

[1]Stier, Jr., William F. An Investigation Into 9 General Areas & 44 Specific Sub-Areas Of Physical Education Currently In Existence In The 2 Year Institutions Of Higher Learning In The Continental United States (1970-1971). Research In Education, ERIC, ED 058875, May 1972, pp. 19.

RESEARCHER: Dr. William F. Stier, Jr.
Chairperson/Professor: Physical Education and Sport
Athletic Director
State University of New York
Brockport, New York 14420